

Thus, the combination of Johnston et al. and Saegusa et al. teaches transmitting both the identification number and the verification of the identification number through an over-the-air interface. As such, one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to Haraguchi et al. since it teaches transmitting an identification code through battery cradle connectors, and teaches away from over-the-air transmission, as in the combination of Johnston et al. and Saegusa et al. Moreover, since both the transmission of the identification number and the corresponding acknowledgment are taught in the combination of Johnston et al. and Saegusa et al., there is no reason for one of ordinary skill in the art to look for a different method of transmitting an acknowledgment through a different form of transmission, such as through battery cradle connectors as taught in Haraguchi et al.

Moreover, even if combined, the cited references still would not disclose or suggest transmitting the acknowledgment signal via a local connection which is separate from the radio connection, through which an identifier is transmitted. The Haraguchi et al. reference teaches that a command signal CMND which includes an identification code ID is transmitted through contacts 278 and 178 to the handset unit 1 (see Figs. 7 and 8). Subsequently, the command signal CMND, including the identification code ID, is echoed back to the base unit 2 by an FM signal Su through radio waves. Upon determination that the identification code ID included in the command signal CMND echoed back by the FM signal Su is the same as the identification code ID which was initially sent to the handset unit are the same, another command signal CMND indicative of acknowledgment of the identification code ID is sent to the handset unit again through the contacts 278 and 178 (see Fig. 8 and col. 13, lines 14-45).

Thus, the Haraguchi et al. reference teaches sending the identification code and the acknowledgment signal through the same physical connection, i.e., the contacts 278, 178. Thus, even if Haraguchi et al. were combined with the Johnston et al. and Saegusa et al. references, the resulting device would send both the identification code ID and the acknowledgment on the same connection, whether physical contacts or over-the-air, since each reference teaches communicating through the same connection, either over-the-air or direct contacts. In contrast, the identifier is transmitted via a radio connection and the acknowledgment signal is transmitted via a local connection, which is separate from the radio connection, in the present invention. Since the cited references, even if combined, would not disclose or suggest this feature as described in claims 12, 13 and 14, these claims are allowable over the cited references.

Claims 2-10 depend from claim 12 and are also allowable for the reason given with respect to claim 12, and because of the additional features recited in these claims.

Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnston et al., Saegusa et al., Haraguchi et al. and further in view of a Chiu et al. or D'Amico et al. These claims depend from claim 12 and are also allowable for the reasons given with respect to claim 12, and because of the additional features recited in these claims.

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnston et al., Saegusa et al. and Haraguchi et al. and further in view of Anglikowski et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons given with respect to claims 12 and 13.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are both not anticipated and non-obvious over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY



B. Joe Kim

Reg. No. 41,895

P.O. Box 1135

Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135

Phone: (312) 807-4354

Date: May 19, 2003